

Ehrlichman

ny 4/18/74  
mlms

- 1 Mar 74 - Ehrlichman indicted.
- 29 Mar 74 - "[Ehrlichman], concerned about a potential conflict of interest with [Haldeman], has decided to drop [Wilson] as his lawyer for the Watergate trials, sources close to the case disclosed [today]. Mr. Ehrlichman was said to have concluded earlier this month that [Wilson's] joint representation of him and [Haldeman] 'wouldn't be fair to the court and to himself,' a source close to [Ehrlichman] explained. .... Inevitably, too, the sources said, separate representation for [Ehrlichman] could lead to efforts by the Watergate special prosecutor's office to renew plea bargaining attempts with him. Such talks have failed in the past. ....
- "None of the sources interviewed today could, or would, explain why, if a separation of counsel was necessary, it was decided that [Ehrlichman] and not [Haldeman] would be the one to go looking for new representation. The sources denied that there had been a rift between the men.
- "It was John's own choice," one closely involved official said. "He was the one who went out looking for another lawyer." .... [Ehrlichman] has been reported to be wavering on a number of occasions in the last year in his determination to stand trial, most recently early in January when he was said to be plea bargaining with attorneys representing [Jaworski]."
- NYT 30 Mar 74, Hersh
- 30 Mar 74 - Ehrlichman, in statement issued in Seattle, confirms he has dropped Wilson, says he has retained William S. Frates of Miami, described by NYT as "an attorney closely associated with ... Rebozo." "Sources close to the matter" emphasize that Ehrlichman's decision does not presage any significant change in attitude on his part toward Haldeman or Nixon. "One closely involved official, told of Ehrlichman's decision to hire Frates, raised the question of whether

Ehrlichman, 2

[Frates] might also face a conflict of interest problem because of his involvement with Rebozo [having represented Rebozo during appearances before Ervin committee in connection with Hughes' \$100,000 contribution]."

SFC 1 Apr 74 [NYT - do not have]

31 Mar 74 - DeMarco testifies before Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation today, a Sunday, "after President Nixon released him [no date] from the confidentiality constraints of the lawyer-client relationship." LATimes says 5 Apr that DeMarco, in testimony to this committee (no date - today? earlier?), said he had operated on instructions relayed through Ehrlichman, and that copies of the Ehrlichman directives given (no date) to the committee and IRS "make it clear that he and Blech were operating on White House instructions in claiming deductions." DeMarco says (no date) it would be "ridiculous" to believe that he and Blech had made the decisions they did without instructions from Nixon or his representatives. LATimes says today that DeMarco, in private conversations with friends, "has frequently voiced concern that he and Blech ultimately could become scapegoats .... "

NYT 6 Apr 74 [UPI]

1 Apr 74 - "Congressional staff investigators have completed their examination [no date] of President Nixon's tax returns.... The staff's report ... has been taken [no date] under armed guard to the section of the Government Printing Office that deals with secret documents.... " It appears that DeMarco's testimony 31 Mar, following waiving of lawyer-client confidentiality, came too late for inclusion in the staff report. Several members of the committee are opposed to making the report public before the committee itself has had an opportunity to study and possibly amend it.

NYT 2 Apr 74, Shanahan

Ehrlichman, 3

3 Apr 74 - Report of staff of Joint Committee is made public. From White House statement issued four hours later: "Any errors which may have been made in the preparation of the President's  
✓ returns were made by those to whom he delegated the responsibility for preparing his returns and were made without his knowledge and without his approval."

NYT 4 Apr 74, p. 29